

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/535,050	HARBEC ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlos Barcena	1793	

All Participants:

(1) Carlos Barcena

(2) Joan Van Zant

Date of Interview: 14 December 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

None

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Call was made to discuss process limitations in the Meunier Declaration not recited in claims which could make the claims allowable if recited in the claims. Specifically, wherein the carbon containing gas is injected only within the nozzle and is not present inside the plasma torch (Meunier Declaration p. 4) and the term heterogeneous. The definition of the word heterogeneous with respect to the reaction was discussed. Applicant explained it meant a dual or two-phase zone (hot and cold) as opposed to the traditional meaning of two different physical phases like solid/liquid.